

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-33 are pending, of which claims 1, 12, 14, 22, and 26 have been amended.

5 Applicant's amendments and remarks after Final are appropriate under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 because they address the Office's remarks in the Final Action, and thus could not have been presented earlier. In addition, the amendments and remarks should be entered to place the case in better form for appeal.

10

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2-3, 7, 12, and 21 are indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form (*Office Action* p.11). Applicant appreciates the indication of allowability.

15 Claims 22 and 26 have been amended to include the allowable feature(s) of claim 12. Accordingly, claim 22 along with dependent claims 23-25, and claim 26 along with dependent claims 27-29 are in condition for allowance.

New claim 30 is a combination of claim 1 and allowable claim 12. New claim 31 also includes the allowable feature(s) of claim 12. Accordingly new
20 claims 30 and 31 are in condition for allowance.

New claim 32 is a combination of claims 14, 19, and allowable claim 21. New claim 33 also includes the allowable feature(s) of claim 21. Accordingly, new claims 32 and 33 are in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. §103 Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 4-6, 8-11, 13-20, 22-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over U.S. Patent No. 5,805,412 to Yanagisawa et al. (hereinafter, "Yanagisawa") (*Office Action* p.2). Applicant respectfully
 5 traverses the claim rejections.

Claim 1 recites a system comprising "an input/output module configured for installation within a housing inset of a housing of the mobile computing device, the input/output module configured to interlock within the housing
 10 inset to facilitate portability of the mobile computing device with the input/output module installed".

Yanagisawa does not teach an input/output module configured for installation within a housing inset of a housing of the mobile computing device, as recited in claim 1. Yanagisawa also does not teach that the input/output
 15 module is configured to interlock within the housing inset to facilitate portability of the mobile computing device with the input/output module installed, as recited in claim 1.

Yanagisawa describes a docking unit (200) that can be coupled with and separated from a notebook computer, and that has a connector which engages a
 20 docking connector of the notebook computer (*Yanagisawa* col.5, lines 31-36; Figs. 1 and 5). The docking unit and/or docking unit connector of Yanagisawa is not configured for installation within a housing inset of a housing of the mobile computing device, as recited in claim 1. The connector of docking unit (200) merely engages the docking connector on a rear face of the notebook
 25 computer (*Yanagisawa* col.7, lines 12-14).

Additionally, the docking unit of Yanagisawa does not interlock within a housing inset to facilitate portability of a mobile computing device, as recited

in claim 1. To the contrary, the docking unit of Yanagisawa provides a fixed computing location for cable management which teaches away from the portability of a mobile computing device.

Accordingly, claim 1 along with dependent claims 2-13 are allowable
5 over Yanagisawa for at least the reasons described above, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 14 recites “an interchangeable input/output module configured for installation within a housing inset of a mobile computer, the interchangeable
10 input/output module configured to interlock within the housing inset to facilitate portability of the mobile computer with the interchangeable input/output module installed”.

As similarly described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1, Yanagisawa does not teach an interchangeable input/output module configured
15 for installation within a housing inset of a mobile computer, or that the interchangeable input/output module is configured to interlock within the housing inset to facilitate portability of the mobile computer with the interchangeable input/output module installed, as recited in claim 14.

Accordingly, claim 14 along with dependent claims 15-21 are allowable
20 over Yanagisawa for at least the reasons described above, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 22 and 26: As described above in Allowable Subject Matter, independent claims 22 and 26 have been amended to include the allowable
25 feature(s) of claim 12. Accordingly, claims 22-25 and 26-29 are allowable over Yanagisawa, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.


Conclusion

Pending claims 1-33 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. If
5 any issues remain that preclude issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

10

Dated: Dec. 28, 2004

By: 
David A. Morasch
Reg. No. 42,905
(509) 324-9256 x 210